

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, 7, 12, 16-19, 26 and 30-33 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, claims 2-4, 6, 8-11, 13-15, 20-25, 27-29, and 34-37 are the claims currently pending in the Application.

Claims 2, 9, 13, 20, 23, 24, 27 and 37 are amended to clarify features recited thereby. These amendments are fully supported by Applicant's disclosure.

Rejection of Claims 1-37 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Boesch et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,092,053. This rejection is traversed.

Independent claims 2, 13 and 27 require, *inter alia*, designating by the user one of the alternative pieces of information as the designated customer information and taking an order using the designated customer information.

The Examiner cites Boesch, column 9, lines 61 - column 10, line 17, and alleges that the cited reference discloses that at least one of the plurality of alternative pieces of information provided by the user is displayed. Boesch in the cited passage discloses that the consumer has several possible entries in the same information bloc with one preferred entry, such that the system chooses the preferred entry that is entered into the information bloc via any known selection process, for example, the most popular entry or the most recently used entry. That is, the cited passage discloses that the system chooses one of the possible entries as the preferred entry.

Boesch does not disclose or suggest designating by the user one of the alternative pieces of information as the designated customer information and taking an order using the designated customer information. First, Boesch does not disclose or suggest the user designating one of the alternative pieces of information as the designated entry. Further, since the cited reference does not disclose or suggest this feature, it is incapable of disclosing or suggesting taking an order using the customer information designated by the user as the designated customer information.

As discussed, among the problems recognized and solved by Applicant's claimed invention is that of allowing the customer to choose or designate among the alternative pieces of information stored by the system. For example, according to an aspect of Applicant's claimed invention, the customer can choose between one of several addresses to which the product being purchased is to be delivered.

Boesch does not disclose or suggest this problem, let alone disclose or suggest the solutions provided by Applicant's claimed invention. Therefore, Boesch belongs to the prior art recognized by Applicant's claimed Disclosure and does not even remote does not even remotely disclose or suggest Applicant's claimed invention. Accordingly, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing discussion, the Application is now believed to be allowable and the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejection, and to allow the Application. Should the Examiner have any questions about the within

remarks, or about the Application generally, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "George Brieger". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "George" and last name "Brieger" clearly distinguishable.

George Brieger
Registration No. 52,652

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343 Ext. 503
GB/ns